

REMARKS

Introduction:

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1, 5, 7, 8 and 10-13 have been amended. No new matter has been presented. Therefore, claims 1-14 are pending in the application and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a):

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-14 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsuzaki et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,813,357 B1 (hereinafter referred to as "Matsuzaki"). These rejections are overcome.

Regarding the rejection of claim 1, it is noted that claim 1 recites that the key distribution server distributes individual decryption information respectively corresponding to each one of said specific number of subscriber terminals and used to perform decryption of said first group key, and individual key update information respectively corresponding to each one of said specific number of subscriber terminals. These features are not found in Matsuzaki.

Matsuzaki is directed to an exclusive key sharing method in which exclusive information C2 of the terminal 5 is calculated and distributed along with preparatory information C1 and ciphertext C3 to terminals 1-4 when terminal 5 is lost. Terminals 1-4 then perform a series of calculations that allow them to share the common key K and, concurrently, terminal 5 is unable to perform the calculations and, as a result, cannot share the common key K.

As such, it may be seen that, while C2 represents exclusive information of terminal 5, Matsuzaki clearly discloses that it is nevertheless distributed to terminals 1-4. This stands in contract to the claimed invention in which the individual decryption information and the individual key update information are distributed respectively to each one of said specific number of subscriber terminals. Moreover, it may be further seen that Matsuzaki does not contain any additional disclosure that preparatory information C1 and ciphertext C3 are individualized and distributed to respectively to each one of said specific number of subscriber terminals.

Application Serial No: 10/511,466
Response dated: June 6, 2008
In Reply to Office action dated: April 1, 2008

Thus, applicants respectfully assert that claim 1, as amended, is patentably distinguished from the reference to Matsuzaki and that, therefore, the rejection of claim 1 is overcome.

Regarding the rejections of claims 5, 7, 8 and 10-13, it is noted that these claims recite similar features as claim 1 and that, therefore, the rejections of these claims are overcome for similar reasons as set forth above.

Regarding the rejections of claims 2-4, 6, 9 and 14, it is noted that these rejections are overcome for at least the reasons set forth above.

Conclusion:

It is believed that the foregoing amendments and remarks place the application in condition for allowance and an early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' attorney at the below listed phone number regarding this response or otherwise concerning the present application.

If there are any additional charges with respect to this Amendment or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 06-1130.

Respectfully submitted,
CANTOR COLBURN LLP
Applicants' Attorneys

By Howard I. Levy
Howard I. Levy
Registration No. 55,378
Customer No. 23413
Cantor Colburn LLP
1800 Diagonal Rd, Suite 510
Alexandria, VA 22314
Telephone: (703) 236-4500
Fax: (703) 236-4501

Date: June 6, 2008